



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/476,321	01/03/2000	CARL OPPEDAHLL	ASCOP065USFU.	7662

2512 7590 09/25/2003

PERMAN & GREEN  
425 POST ROAD  
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

SHERR, CRISTINA O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3621	

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/476,321	OPPEDAHL, CARL
	Examiner Cristina O Sherr	Art Unit 3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. 
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's Amendment filed 17 January 2003. Claims 1-23 are pending in this case.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cordery et al (US 6,175,827B1).

5. Regarding claim1 –

Cordery discloses an improved system for authentication of mail pieces bearing bar-coded indicia, the system comprising first and second bar-code readers, said first and second bar-code readers differing in that said first bar-code reader has a lower rate of successful reading of bar-coded indicia than said second bar-code reader, said system defining a first paper path through said first bar-code reader and subsequently through a first collator, said system disposed to collate a mail piece bearing an indicium in a

second paper path in the event of a successful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said first bar-code reader, said system disposed to collate mail pieces in a third paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said first bar-code reader, said third paper path leading to said second bar-code reader, said system disposed to collate mail pieces in a fourth paper path in the event of a successful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader, said system disposed to collate mail pieces in a fifth paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader (Col 4 ln 20 – col 6 ln 40).

6. Regarding claim 2 –

Cordery discloses the improved system of claim 1 further comprising a third bar-code reader, said second and third bar-code readers differing in that said second bar-code reader has a lower rate of successful reading of bar-coded indicia than said third bar-code reader, said system further defining said fifth paper path through a second collator, said system disposed to collate mail pieces in a sixth paper path in the event of a successful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second barcode reader, said system disposed to collate mail pieces in a seventh paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader (col 5 ln 36-52).

7. Regarding claim 3 –

Cordery discloses the improved system of claim 1 wherein the first bar-code reader is less expensive than the second bar-code reader (Col 5 ln 28-35).

Art Unit: 3621

8. Regarding claim 4 –

Cordery discloses the improved system of claim 1 wherein the first bar-code reader is faster than the second bar-code reader (Col 6 In 6 – 15).

9. Regarding claim 5 –

Cordery discloses the improved system of claim 1 wherein the first bar-code reader has lower scanning resolution than the second bar-code reader (Col 5 In 5-12).

10. Claims 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cordery et al (US 6,175,827B1).

11. Regarding claim 6 –

Cordery discloses a method for authenticating mail pieces bearing bar-coded indicia, the method comprising the steps of passing a mail piece bearing an indicium through a first bar-code reader, subsequently automatically collating said mail piece to a second paper path to a second bar-code reader in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said indicium by said first bar-code reader, said first and second bar-code readers differing in that said first bar-code reader has a lower rate of successful reading of bar-coded indicia than said second bar-code reader (Col 4 In 20 – col 6 In 40).

12. Regarding claim 7 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 6 further comprising subsequently automatically collating said mail piece to a third paper path in the event of successful reading of said indicium by said second barcode reader (Col 6 In 30-40).

13. Regarding claim 8 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 6 further comprising subsequently automatically collating said mail piece to a fourth paper path to a third bar-code reader in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader, said second and third bar-code readers differing in that said second bar-code reader has a lower rate of successful reading of bar-coded indicia than said third bar-code reader (Col. 6 In 23-29).

14. Regarding claim 9 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 8 further comprising subsequently automatically collating said mail piece to a fifth paper path in the event of successful reading of said indicium by said third barcode reader (Col. 5 In 52-59).

15. Regarding claim 10 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 8 further comprising subsequently automatically collating said mail piece to a sixth paper path in the event of unsuccessful reading of said indicium by said third barcode reader (Col. 5 In 52-59).

16. Regarding claim 11 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 7 further comprising the step of delivering the mail piece after said successful reading of said indicium by said second bar-code reader (Col 6 In 23-28).

17. Regarding claim 12 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 9 further comprising the step of delivering the mail piece after said successful reading of said indicium by said third bar-code reader (Col 6 In 23-28).

Art Unit: 3621

18. Regarding claim 13 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 6 further comprising subsequently automatically collating said mail piece to a fifth paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader (Col. 5 In 52-59).

19. Regarding claim 14 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 13 further comprising the step of returning the mail piece to the sender after unsuccessful reading of said bar code by said second bar-code reader (Col 6 In 7-15).

20. Regarding claim 15 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 10 further comprising the step of returning the mail piece to the sender after unsuccessful reading of said bar code by said third bar-code reader (Col 6 In 7-15).

21. Regarding claim 16 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 6 further comprising subsequently performing a cryptographic authentication of said indicium and automatically collating said mail piece to a seventh paper path in the event of successful authentication of said bar code by said second bar-code reader (Col 9 In 41-61).

22. Regarding claim 17 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 6 further comprising subsequently performing a cryptographic authentication of said indicium and automatically collating said mail piece to an eighth paper path in the event of unsuccessful authentication of said bar code by said second bar-code reader (Col 9 In 53-61).

23. Regarding claim 18 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 9 further comprising subsequently performing a cryptographic authentication of said indicium and automatically collating said mail piece to a ninth paper path in the event of successful authentication of said bar code by said third bar-code reader (Col 9 In 41-61).

24. Regarding claim 19 –

Cordery discloses the method of claim 9 further comprising subsequently performing a cryptographic authentication of said indicium and automatically collating said mail piece to a tenth paper path in the event of unsuccessful authentication of said bar code by said third bar-code reader (Col 9 In 53-61).

25. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cordery et al (US 6,175,827B1).

26. Regarding claim 20 –

Cordery discloses an improved system for authentication of mail pieces bearing bar-coded indicia, the system comprising first, second, and third bar-code readers, said first and third bar-code readers differing in that said first bar-code reader has a lower rate of successful reading of bar-coded indicia than said third bar-code reader, said second and third bar-code readers differing in that said second bar-code reader has a lower rate of successful reading of bar-coded indicia than said third barcode reader, said system defining a first paper path through said first bar-code reader and subsequently through a first collator, said system disposed to collate a mail piece bearing an indicium in a second paper path in the event of a successful reading of said bar-coded indicium

Art Unit: 3621

by said first bar-code reader, said system disposed to collate mail pieces in a third paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said first bar-code reader, said third paper path leading to said third bar-code reader, said system defining a fourth paper path through said second bar-code reader and subsequently through a second collator, said system disposed to collate a mail piece bearing an indicium in a fifth paper path in the event of a successful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader, said system disposed to collate mail pieces in a sixth paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said second bar-code reader, said sixth paper path leading to said third bar-code reader said system disposed to collate mail pieces in a seventh paper path in the event of a successful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said third bar-code reader, said system disposed to collate mail pieces in an eighth paper path in the event of an unsuccessful reading of said bar-coded indicium by said third bar-code reader (Col 4 In 20 – col 6 In 40).

27. Regarding claim 21 –

Cordery discloses the improved system of claim 20 wherein the first and second bar-code readers are each less expensive than the third bar-code reader (Col 5 In 28-35).

28. Regarding claim 22 –

Cordery discloses the improved system of claim 20 wherein the first and second bar-code readers are each faster than the third bar-code reader (Col 6 In 6 – 15).

29. Regarding claim 23 –

Cordery discloses the improved system of claim 20 wherein the first and second bar-code readers each have lower scanning resolution than the third bar-code reader (Col 5 In 5-12).

30. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.


#### ***Conclusion***

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cristina O Sherr whose telephone number is 703-305-0625. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 to 5:00.
32. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.
33. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/476,321  
Art Unit: 3621

Page 10

\*\*\*



JAMES P. TRAMMELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600